Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/633,876	HALE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mina Haghighatian	1616
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Active</u>		
(1) <u>Mina Haghighatian</u> .	(3)	
(2) Katherine Lobel-Rice.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 22 September 2009	Time:	
Type of Interview:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 20		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. Tof the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand</li> </ul>	he examiner will provide a writte e record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Mina Haghighatian/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1616	(Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Exmainer telephoned Applicant to discuss possible amendment to claim 20 in order to place all claims in condition for allowance. Examiner suggested inserting the limitation "wherein the device produces a condensation aerosol containing less than about 10% or less .by weight drug composition degradation products and at least 50% of the drug composition of said film" (as is in claim 1) into claim 20 for better distinction of instant claims from prior art. Ms. Lobel-Rice agreed to the proposed amendments, shown by way of an Examiner's Amendment (attached).